

INTERACTIVE GAMES, DIALOGUES AND THE VERBALIZATION

DENIS V. JURIEV

ul.Miklukho-Maklaya 20-180, Moscow 117437 Russia

E-mail: denis@juriev.msk.ru

math.OC/9903001

This note is devoted to an interactive game theoretic formalization of dialogues as psycholinguistic phenomena and the unraveling of a hidden dialogue structure (the “verbalization”) of 2-person differential interactive games. In the field-theoretic description of interactive games the dialogues are defined naïvely as interactive games of discrete time with intention fields of continuous time; the correct mathematical formulation of such definition is proposed. The states and the controls of a dialogue correspond to the speech whereas the intention fields describe the understanding. In the case of dialogues the main inverse problem of interactive game theory is to describe geometrical and algebraical properties of the understanding. On the other hand, a precise mathematical definition of dialogues allows to formulate a problem of the unraveling of a hidden dialogue structure of any 2-person differential interactive game. Such procedure is called the verbalization. It means that the states of a differential interactive game are interpreted as intention fields of a hidden dialogue and the problem is to describe such dialogue completely. If a 2-person differential interactive game is verbalizable one is able to consider many linguistic (e.g. the formal grammar of a related hidden dialogue) or psycholinguistic (e.g. the dynamical correlation of various implications) aspects of it.

The mathematical formalism of interactive games, which extends one of ordinary games [1] and is based on the concept of an interactive control, was proposed by the author [2] to take into account the complex composition of controls of a real human person, which are often complicated couplings of his/her cognitive and known controls with the unknown subconscious behavioral reactions. This formalism is applicable also to the description of external unknown influences and, thus, is useful for problems in computer science (e.g. the semi-artificially controlled distribution of resources) and mathematical economics (e.g. the financial games with unknown dynamical factors). This article is devoted to an embedding of dialogues as psycholinguistic phenomena into the interactive game theoretic picture. It will allow to apply the interactive game theoretic methods (such as *a posteriori* analysis and short-term prediction procedures) to the dialogues and to adapt *vice versa* the

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 90D25 (Primary) 90D05, 49N55, 34H05, 93C41, 93B52 (Secondary).

Key words and phrases. Differential interactive games, Interactive controls, 2-person games, Dialogues, Verbalization.

linguistic and psycholinguistic approaches to a wide class of the arbitrary 2-person interactive games of the nonverbal origin, especially to the computer interactive videogames. The linguistic and psycholinguistic methods may be crucial for the unraveling of the hidden verbal character of the accelerated naturally nonverbal cognitive computer and telecommunications based on dreams and their dynamical reconstruction [4].

I. INTERACTIVE GAMES

1.1. Interactive systems and intention fields.

Definition 1 [2]. *An interactive system (with n interactive controls) is a control system with n independent controls coupled with unknown or incompletely known feedbacks (the feedbacks, which are called the *behavioral reactions*, as well as their couplings with controls are of a so complicated nature that their can not be described completely). An interactive game is a game with interactive controls of each player.*

Below we shall consider only deterministic and differential interactive systems. For simplicity we suppose that $n = 2$. In this case the general interactive system may be written in the form:

$$(1) \quad \dot{\varphi} = \Phi(\varphi, u_1, u_2),$$

where φ characterizes the state of the system and u_i are the interactive controls:

$$u_i(t) = u_i(u_i^\circ(t), [\varphi(\tau)]|_{\tau \leq t}),$$

i.e. the independent controls $u_i^\circ(t)$ coupled with the feedbacks on $[\varphi(\tau)]|_{\tau \leq t}$. One may suppose that the feedbacks are integrodifferential on t .

Proposition [2]. *Each interactive system (1) may be transformed to the form (2) below (which is not, however, unique):*

$$(2) \quad \dot{\varphi} = \tilde{\Phi}(\varphi, \xi),$$

where the magnitude ξ (with infinite degrees of freedom as a rule) obeys the equation

$$(3) \quad \dot{\xi} = \Xi(\xi, \varphi, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2),$$

where $\tilde{u}_i$ are the interactive controls of the form $\tilde{u}_i(t) = \tilde{u}_i(u_i^\circ(t); \varphi(t), \xi(t))$ (here the dependence of $\tilde{u}_i$ on $\xi(t)$ and $\varphi(t)$ is differential on t , i.e. the feedbacks are precisely of the form $\tilde{u}_i(t) = \tilde{u}_i(u_i^\circ(t); \varphi(t), \xi(t), \dot{\varphi}(t), \dot{\xi}(t), \ddot{\varphi}(t), \ddot{\xi}(t), \dots, \varphi^{(k)}(t), \xi^{(k)}(t))$).

Remark 1. One may exclude $\varphi(t)$ from the feedbacks in the interactive controls $\tilde{u}_i(t)$. One may also exclude the derivatives of ξ and φ on t from the feedbacks.

Definition 2 [2]. The magnitude ξ with its dynamical equations (3) and its contribution into the interactive controls $\tilde{u}_i$ will be called *the intention field*.

Note that the theorem holds true for the interactive games. In practice, the intention fields may be often considered as a field-theoretic description of subconscious

individual and collective behavioral reactions. However, they may be used also the accounting of unknown or incompletely known external influences. Therefore, such approach is applicable to problems of computer science (e.g. semi-automatically controlled resource distribution) or mathematical economics (e.g. financial games with unknown factors). The interactive games with the differential dependence of feedbacks are called *differential*. Thus, the theorem states a possibility of a reduction of any interactive game to a differential interactive game by introduction of additional parameters – *the intention fields*.

1.2. Differential interactive games and their ε –representation.

The most powerful way to investigate differential interactive games is their *a posteriori* analysis [3]. The ε –representation of differential interactive games is a very convenient form of their recording to perform such analysis. In the next paragraph ε –representation will be used to give the precise interactive game theoretical definition of dialogues.

Definition 3. The ε –representation of differential interactive game is a representation of the differential feedbacks in the form

$$(4) \quad u_i(t) = u_i(u_i^\circ, \varphi(t), \dots, \varphi^{(k)}(t); \varepsilon_i(t))$$

with the known function u_i of all its arguments, where the magnitudes $\varepsilon_i(t) \in \mathcal{E}$ are *unknown* functions of u_i° and $\varphi(t)$ with its higher derivatives:

$$\varepsilon_i(t) = \varepsilon_i(u_i^\circ(t), \varphi(t), \dot{\varphi}(t), \dots, \varphi^{(k)}(t)).$$

The short-term predictions based on a *a posteriori* analysis of differential interactive games use some their ε –representations with the frozen parameters $\varepsilon_i(t)$ at the moment t_0 .

II. DIALOGUES AND INTERACTIVE GAMES

2.1. Dialogues as interactive games.

Let us formalize dialogues as psycholinguistic phenomena in terms of interactive games. First of all, note that one is able to consider interactive games of discrete time as well as interactive games of continuous time above.

Defintion 4A (the naïve definition of dialogues). The *dialogue* is a 2-person interactive game of discrete time with intention fields of continuous time.

The states and the controls of a dialogue correspond to the speech whereas the intention fields describe the understanding.

Let us give the formal mathematical definition of dialogues now.

Definition 4B (the formal definition of dialogues). The *dialogue* is a 2-person interactive game of discrete time of the form

$$(5) \quad \varphi_n = \Phi(\varphi_{n-1}, \vec{v}_n, \xi(\tau) | t_{n-1} \leq \tau \leq t_n).$$

Here $\varphi_n = \varphi(t_n)$ are the states of the system at the moments t_n ($t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n < \dots$), $\vec{v}_n = \vec{v}(t_n) = (v_1(t_n), v_2(t_n))$ are the interactive controls at the same moments; $\xi(\tau)$ are the intention fields of continuous time with evolution equations

$$(6) \quad \dot{\xi}(t) = \Xi(\xi(t), \vec{u}(t)),$$

where $\vec{u}(t) = (u_1(t), u_2(t))$ are continuous interactive controls with ε -represented couplings of feedbacks:

$$u_i(t) = u_i(u_i^\circ(t), \xi(t); \varepsilon_i(t)).$$

The states φ_n and the interactive controls $\vec{v}_n$ are certain *known* functions of the form

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} \varphi_n &= \varphi_n(\vec{\varepsilon}(\tau), \xi(\tau) | t_{n-1} \leq \tau \leq t_n), \\ \vec{v}_n &= \vec{v}_n(\vec{u}^\circ(\tau), \xi(\tau) | t_{n-1} \leq \tau \leq t_n). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the most nontrivial part of mathematical formalization of dialogues is the claim that the states of the dialogue (which describe a speech) are certain “mean values” of the ε -parameters of the intention fields (which describe the understanding).

Remark 2. Note that in the case of dialogues the main inverse problem of interactive game theory [2] means to describe geometrical and algebraical properties of the understanding.

The definition of dialogue may be generalized on arbitrary number of players.

2.2. Unraveling a hidden dialogue structure of 2-person differential interactive games. The verbalization.

An embedding of dialogues into the interactive game theoretical picture generates the reciprocal problem: how to interpret an arbitrary differential interactive game as a dialogue. Such interpretation will be called the *verbalization*.

Definition 5. A differential interactive game of the form

$$\dot{\varphi}(t) = \Phi(\varphi(t), \vec{u}(t))$$

with ε -represented couplings of feedbacks

$$u_i(t) = u_i(u_i^\circ(t), \varphi(t), \dot{\varphi}(t), \ddot{\varphi}(t), \dots, \varphi^{(k)}(t); \varepsilon_i(t))$$

is called *verbalizable* if there exist *a posteriori* partition $t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n < \dots$ and the integrodifferential functionals

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} \omega_n &= \omega_n(\vec{\varepsilon}(\tau), \varphi(\tau) | t_{n-1} \leq \tau \leq t_n), \\ \vec{v}_n &= \vec{v}_n(\vec{u}^\circ(\tau), \varphi(\tau) | t_{n-1} \leq \tau \leq t_n) \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$(9) \quad \omega_n = \Omega(\omega_{n-1}, v_n; \varphi(\tau) | t_{n-1} \leq \tau \leq t_n).$$

The verbalizable differential interactive games realize a dialogue in sense of Def.4.

The main heuristic hypothesis is that all differential interactive games “which appear in practice” are verbalizable. The verbalization means that the states of a differential interactive game are interpreted as intention fields of a hidden dialogue and the problem is to describe such dialogue completely. If a 2-person differential interactive game is verbalizable one is able to consider many linguistic (e.g. the formal grammar of a related hidden dialogue) or psycholinguistic (e.g. the dynamical correlation of various implications) aspects of it.

Remark 3. It will be very interesting to understand the possible connections between quantization of interactive games [2] and their verbalization.

Remark 4. The verbalization may be an important part of the strategical analysis of differential interactive games beyond the short-term predictions [3].

III. CONCLUSIONS

Thus, the interactive game theoretic formalization of dialogues as psycholinguistic phenomena was performed and the unraveling of a hidden dialogue structure (the “verbalization”) of 2-person differential interactive games was initiated. It will allow to apply the interactive game theoretic methods to the dialogues and to adapt *vice versa* the linguistic and psycholinguistic approaches to a wide class of the arbitrary 2-person interactive games of the nonverbal origin.

REFERENCES

- [1] Isaaks R., Differential games. Wiley, New York, 1965;
Owen G., Game theory, Saunders, Philadelphia, 1968.
- [2] Juriev D., Interactive games and representation theory. I,II. E-prints: math.FA/9803020, math.RT/9808098.
- [3] Juriev D., The laced interactive games and their *a posteriori* analysis. E-print: math.OC/9901043; Differential interactive games: The short-term predictions. E-print: math.OC/9901074.
- [4] Juriev D., Droems: experimental mathematics, informatics and infinite dimensional geometry. Report RCMP-96/05+ [e-version: cs.HC/9809119].